



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,897

11/21/2003

Norimitsu Fukami

F-9(KC)/FP 1501

1430

26021 7590 07/29/2008

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/719,897	Applicant(s) FUKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner DABORAH CHACKO DAVIS	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr Matthew C. Lee, Reg. No. 58,189. (3) ____.

(2) Daborah Chacko-Davis. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 25 July 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: U. S. Patent No. 6,143,116 (Hayashi et al).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative said that Hayashi does not teach a photocurable slurry, and that the slurry of Hayashi does not fill the gaps between the circuit patterns; and that Hayashi does not teach the process illustrated on page 12 of 16, of the Draft response, filed July 21, 2008, and that Hayashi's method differs from the limitations of the independent claim.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daborah Chacko-Davis/ Examiner, Art Unit 1795	July 25, 2008.
---	----------------